UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,814	01/26/2004	Dale Roush	1041-001	6879

34456 7590 11/07/2008

LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP
5914 WEST COURTYARD DRIVE
SUITE 200
AUSTIN, TX 78730

EXAMINER	
HALL, ARTHUR O	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3714	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/764,814	ROUSH, DALE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ARTHUR O. HALL	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 August 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Examiner acknowledges applicants arguments with respect to claims 1-28 in the Response dated 8/28/2008 directed to the Non-final Office Action dated 5/28/2008. Claims 1-28 are pending in the application and subject to examination as part of this office action.

Examiner acknowledges that applicants arguments directed to the rejection set forth under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are deemed unpersuasive in light of the evidence disclosed in the Reiss et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2001/004336; hereinafter Reiss) and Dreaper et al. (US Patent Application 2004/0063484; hereinafter Dreaper) references cited in the Non-final Office Action dated 5/28/2008, and in view of applicants arguments made in the Response dated 8/28/2008 directed to the Non-final Office Action dated 5/28/2008. Thus, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are not withdrawn. Therefore, Examiner maintains the grounds of rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Examiner maintains and incorporates herein the grounds of rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as described in the Non-final Office Action dated 5/28/2008 because the scope of the claims in the Response dated 8/28/2008 is the same as the scope of the claims examined in the Non-final Office Action dated

5/28/2008 and because each of the features of applicants claimed invention continues to be unpatentable or obvious over the prior art.

Examiner acknowledges that the only modifications made herein are directed to clarification of the grounds of rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as described in the Non-final Office Action dated 5/28/2008.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiss et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2001/004336; hereinafter Reiss) in view of Dreaper et al. (US Patent Application 2004/0063484; hereinafter Dreaper). Features are described by figures with reference characters where necessary for clarity.

Regarding claims 1-2, 13, 20 and 27, Reiss teaches

a computer-implemented method or method of providing interactive entertainment associated with a broadcast sports game or an event related game or media event (paragraph 0025, Reiss; clients or users process game pieces over a computer network between computer terminals for playing an on-line interactive fantasy lottery sports game), comprises:

accessing a game set provided in a printable electronic format (paragraph 0025, Reiss; clients or users access electronic data for the game pieces by requesting information from other connected computers or terminals);

receiving event data associated with a media broadcast or broadcast sports game/event at a computer, **or in other words**, receiving at a computer a request for a printable game set associated with a media broadcast (paragraphs 0026 and 0028, Reiss; clients or users receive information regarding the game pieces for use in the sports game or event after the request is processed by a server);

the printable game set or game set including a set of trade tickets or a plurality of trade tickets, each trade ticket of the set of trade tickets or plurality of trade tickets identifying or including a unique game event or game event (paragraphs 0030 and 0037 and Fig. 2, 24 and 30, Reiss; plural game pieces are provided having sports figures and sporting events associated therewith, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game pieces are printable to be traded amongst clients since Reiss teaches that the assigned players and sports figures associated with the game pieces are even used in a lottery to increase the players odds of success therein based on the corresponding game event), at least one of the plurality of trade tickets including a game win event associated with a team associated with the broadcast sports game (paragraph 0036 and Fig. 2, 25 and 32, Reiss; each client or user wins the prize based on the highest number of points achieved for the game pieces that provide a win condition); and

the printable game set or game set including a unique identification number (paragraph 0034 and Fig. 3, 48, Reiss; an identification block includes the players/event players name so as to track the game pieces of the electronic game set, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game set includes a number associated with each event player since it is well known to utilize numbers to track lottery tickets or to be used as client or user passwords, and because numbers would facilitate the capability for clients or users to select the event players and identify them for the purpose of awards or prizes);

However, Reiss does not appear to teach game cards, printing the game set nor distributing the game cards and trade tickets as claimed. Therefore, attention is directed to Dreaper, which teaches

generating a/the printable game set or game set, **or in other words**, printing the game set (paragraph 0103, Dreaper; the game cards are printed from electronic format at a processing office or game facility, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game cards or game pieces disclosed in Reiss are printed collectively as part of the game set since both the game cards and game pieces are transferred electronically to computers configured for printing),

the printable game set or game set including at least one game card or a plurality of game cards, the at least one game card or each game card of the plurality of game cards including a list/distinct list of game events or listing a unique set of game events or a set of elements associated with the media broadcast or broadcast sports game (paragraph 0025, 0027 and 0106, Dreaper; physical game cards having events or contests printed thereon are associated with broadcasted sports game and received by bettors who input into the game card information into their computers in electronic format for electronic submission to a game facility, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game facility is configurable to be the bettors computer since one having ordinary skill in the art would have understood that the bettors/users computer is configured to provide the game facility functions when utilized for online betting);

providing the printable game set or game set in an electronic format configured or configurable for printing by a user, **or in other words**, providing to a user computer the printable game set in an electronic format configured for printing on paper by a user (paragraph 0105, Dreaper; a virtual game card is displayed on a computer screen from electronic format input by the bettor from the game card received, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game card and game pieces disclosed in Reiss may be printed on the computer that displays the

virtual card since it was well known and inherent at the time of invention that computers are configured for printing); and

distributing one game card of the plurality of game cards and a subset of trade tickets of the set of trade tickets to one of a plurality of players (paragraph 0103, Dreaper; the game cards are dispensed or delivered or distributed to bettors after being printed, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game cards and game pieces disclosed in Reiss are distributed collectively as part of the game set since both the game cards and game pieces are transferred electronically to computers from which each may be distributed to bettors after being printed).

The electronic game piece features disclosed by Reiss are usable with the electronic game card features disclosed by Dreaper for printing and trading since both the game pieces and game cards are implemented for electronic sporting events and are received into a computer configured for printing so as to be printed either at a processing facility or by the bettor or user themselves, and because once the game cards and game pieces are printed, one having ordinary skill in the art would have been inclined to trade the physical game pieces exchanged electronically in Reiss with other clients or users since each client or user requires the opportunity to commonly select a game piece.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the electronic game piece features as taught by Reiss with the electronic game card features configured for and printed as taught by Dreaper to facilitate trading of the game pieces because use of these features in combination would improve the printing, distribution and subsequent trading of game

pieces in a sports event contest in the same manner or way as the game pieces are electronically exchanged between clients or users since the techniques are known to be used in the described way and for the described purposes.

Regarding claim 3, the set of trade tickets includes two trade tickets each indicating a win event for a different team (paragraph 0036 and Fig. 2, 25 and 32, Reiss; a win event occurs when a client obtains the highest number of points to attain the prize and each game piece discloses the number of points obtainable for that game piece and the prize amount is disclosed).

Regarding claims 4 and 17, inserting an advertisement in the printable game set is disclosed (paragraph 0027, Reiss).

Regarding claims 5 and 18, inserting an advertisement on the at least one game card or each of the plurality of game cards is disclosed (paragraph 0027, Reiss; advertising is input into a web page that the client can access, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game cards disclosed in Dreaper have the advertising inserted thereon since the advertising data is provided electronically and would only require arrangement of the advertising text onto a portion of the game card for printing).

Regarding claim 6, retrieving an advertisement from an advertiser system is disclosed (paragraph 0027, Reiss; clients may access an advertisement from the web page).

Regarding claims 7 and 15, acquiring user information from or associated with the user is disclosed (paragraph 0034, Reiss; clients are required to input their user name and password to access their accounts, and it is well known that online accounts require various user data or information for setup).

Regarding claims 10 and 19, associating a unique number with the game set or printable game set is disclosed (paragraph 0034, Reiss; an identification block includes the players name so as to track the game pieces of the electronic game set, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game set is associated with a number for each player since it is well known to utilize numbers to track lottery tickets and because numbers would facilitate the capability for clients or users to select the players and identify them for the purpose of awards or prizes).

Regarding claim 11, the unique number is associated with a lottery (paragraph 0034, Reiss; an identification block includes the players name so as to track the game pieces of the electronic game set to determine success in the sports fantasy lottery, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game set is associated with a number for each player since it is well known to utilize numbers to track lottery tickets and because numbers would facilitate the capability for clients or users to select the players and identify them for the purpose of awards or prizes).

Regarding claim 12, inserting a coupon in the printable game set is disclosed (paragraph 0037, Reiss; promotions are associated with the electronic game pieces, and it is well known that coupons are promotional devices).

Regarding claim 24, a player exchanges a trade ticket with a second player in response to the occurrence of a game event listed on the trade ticket (paragraph 0025, Reiss; clients or users exchange game pieces electronically via computer terminals, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which physical game pieces exchanged electronically in Reiss are traded with other clients or

users since each client or user requires the opportunity to commonly select a game piece).

Regarding claim 25, distributing a prize to a player holding a trade ticket indicating a game winning event upon completion of the media event is disclosed (paragraph 0034, Reiss; a prize is awarded to the client or user when a game piece indicates a win in the lottery for the designated sports event).

Regarding claim 26, displaying the media event is disclosed (paragraph 0030, Reiss; game pieces associated with events are displayed to the client browser).

Regarding claim 28, an award is distributed based at least in part on the unique identification number (paragraph 0034, Reiss; a prized is awarded to the client or user when a game piece including a players name indicates a win in the lottery for the designated sports event, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game set is associated with a number for each player since it is well known to utilize numbers to track lottery tickets and because numbers would facilitate the capability for clients or users to select the players and identify them for the purpose of awards or prizes).

Regarding claims 8 and 16, the user information or information associated with the user includes user location information or location information (paragraphs 0031 and 0106, Dreaper; the bettors or participants information includes the location of the contest or gaming location, which may be the bettors home).

Regarding claim 9, the printable game set is generated using the user information (paragraph 0103 and 0105, Dreaper; the game card is printed from electronic information or data, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to

try an implementation in which the bettors information is part of the printed game card since the game card is distributed directly to the bettor and the bettor may input game card information for printing on their home computer, which could include the bettors information).

Regarding claim 14, the media broadcast or broadcast sports game is a sports event or football game (paragraph 0026, Dreaper).

Regarding claim 21, a player of the plurality of players marks a game card in response to the occurrence of game events included in the distinct list of game events (paragraph 0028, Dreaper; the bettor selects a likely outcome for a game event associated with a game card).

Regarding claim 22, scoring each game card of the plurality of game cards upon completion of the media event is disclosed (paragraphs 0027-0028, Dreaper).

Regarding claim 23, distributing a prize to a player in response to scoring each game card is disclosed (paragraph 0108, Dreaper).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed in the Response dated 8/28/2008 directed to the Examiners' rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been considered fully and are unpersuasive in light of the evidence disclosed in the Reiss and Dreaper references and in view of applicant's arguments thereof.

Regarding applicant's arguments concerning claims 1-28 rejected as unpatentable or obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Applicant argues that Reiss does not teach printing a game set and that Dreaper does not teach printing a game set that includes a game card and set of trade tickets. At the outset, Examiner submits that the list of game events and the identification of a game event are merely indicia that is non-functional descriptive material since the specific content of the indicia does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the Reiss and Dreaper since there is no functional relationship between the indicia or game events and the game card or trade tickets because applicant has not recited how an action or use of the indicia or game events would effect or be functionally connected to the game card or trade tickets, whereby the game card and/or trade tickets would be physically printed (See MPEP 2106.01 Computer-Related Nonstatutory Subject Matter; see also MPEP 2112.01 (III); see also *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (Fed. Cir. 2004), *In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ 410 (Fed. Cir. 1983), and *In re Miller*, 164 USPQ 46 (CCPA 1969)). Thus, Examiner continues to submit that the game cards are printed from electronic format at a processing office or game facility, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game cards or game pieces disclosed in Reiss are printed collectively as part of the game set since both the game cards and game pieces are transferred electronically to computers configured for printing (paragraph 0103, Dreaper). Further, Examiner continues to submit that a virtual game card is displayed on a computer screen from electronic format input by the bettor from the game card received, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game card and game pieces disclosed in Reiss may

be printed on a computer that displays the virtual card since it was well known and inherent at the time of invention that computers are configured for printing (paragraph 0105, Dreaper).

Applicant argues that the game piece disclosed in Reiss "is not part of a game set that includes a set of trade tickets," and that Dreaper does not teach "a game set that includes game cards and a set of trade tickets." Examiner continues to submits that Reiss discloses plural game pieces having sports figures and sporting events associated therewith that are configured to be a printable set of trade tickets that identify game events in which players may exchange amongst themselves since Reiss does not specifically or inherently teach away from game pieces being trading tickets because Reiss teaches that the assigned players and sports figures associated with the game pieces are even used in a lottery to increase the each players' odds of success therein based on the corresponding game event (paragraphs 0030 and 0037 and Fig. 2, 24 and 30, Reiss). Further, Examiner continues to submit that Dreaper discloses physical game cards having events or contests printed thereon that are associated with broadcasted sports games and received by bettors who input the game card information into their computers in electronic format for electronic submission to a game facility, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game facility is configurable to be the bettors computer since one having ordinary skill in the art would have understood that the bettors/users computer is configured to provide

the game facility functions when utilized for online betting (paragraph 0025, 0027 and 0106, Dreaper).

Applicant argues that the combination of Reiss and Dreaper would "change the principle of operation" Reiss and render Reiss inoperable. At the outset, Examiner submits to the applicant that it is not a requirement of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) that all references contain all features of the claimed invention nor that the features of all references be the same as those of the claimed invention in order to render the invention obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention when viewing the subject matter as a whole (See MPEP 2144.08 II., A. 2.; See also *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 218 USPQ 871, 877 (Fed. Cir. 1983)). It is only necessary that each of the features of the invention is disclosed in all references with motivation or suggestion to combine those references to produce the claimed invention. Therefore, Examiner submits that Reiss teaches game pieces that are inherently electronic and printable and does not specifically or inherently teach away from printing game pieces that correspond to trading tickets because Reiss teaches that the assigned players and sports figures associated with the game pieces are used in a lottery to increase the each players' odds of success therein based on the corresponding game event and one having ordinary skill in the art would have understood that the game card and game pieces disclosed in Reiss may be printed on a computer that displays the virtual card disclosed in Dreaper since it was well known and inherent at the time of invention that computers as disclosed in Reiss and Dreaper are configured for printing

(paragraph 0105, Dreaper; see also paragraphs 0030 and 0037 and Fig. 2, 24 and 30, Reiss). Hence, Examiner submits that the principle of operation disclosed in Reiss would not change and the game piece disclosed in Reiss would not be rendered inoperable also since applicant has not recited any particular structure that would affect the disclosure of Reiss or would not be contemplated by Reiss. Moreover, Examiner submits that absent the structure configured to execute a process is merely discussion of intended use of a device and is not given patentable weight when evaluating the claims. Further, if applicant believes that their device is merely "capable of" of performing a function, then the recited device only suggests or makes optional the steps executing the desired function, and thereby does not limit a claim to a particular structure and does not limit the scope of the claim (See MPEP 2106 II, C. Review the Claims). Therefore, Examiner submits that applicants' claims are interpreted as broadly as reasonably allowed in light of the specification in accordance with *In re Zletz* (See *In re Zletz*, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Applicant argues that Reiss does not teach that users or clients can exchange game pieces electronically or physically. As disclosed above, Examiner submits that the list of game events and the identification of a game event are merely indicia that is non-functional descriptive material since the specific content of the indicia does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the Reiss and Dreaper since there is no functional relationship between the indicia or game events and the game card or trade tickets because applicant has not recited how an action or use of the indicia or

game events would effect or be functionally connected to the game card or trade tickets, whereby the game card and/or trade tickets would be physically printed (See MPEP 2106.01 Computer-Related Nonstatutory Subject Matter; see also MPEP 2112.01 (III); see also *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (Fed. Cir. 2004), *In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ 410 (Fed. Cir. 1983), and *In re Miller*, 164 USPQ 46 (CCPA 1969)). Thus, Examiner submits that Reiss is not required to print trade tickets for exchange since the printable game set including trade tickets is never printed as recited in the claims. Regardless, Examiner continues to submit, in view of Reiss and Dreaper, that it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game cards or game pieces disclosed in Reiss are printed collectively as part of the game set since both the game cards and game pieces are transferred electronically to computers configured for printing, and that it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game card and game pieces disclosed in Reiss may be printed on a computer that displays the virtual card since it was well known and inherent at the time of invention that computers are configured for printing (paragraphs 0103 and 0105, Dreaper).

Applicant argues that Reiss does not teach a printable game set that includes a unique identification number. However, Examiner continues to submit that an identification block includes the players/event players name so as to track the game pieces of the electronic game set, and it would have been obvious at the time of invention to try an implementation in which the game set includes a number associated

with each event player since it is well known to utilize numbers to track lottery tickets or to be used as client or user passwords, and because numbers would facilitate the capability for clients or users to select the event players and identify them for the purpose of awards or prizes (paragraphs 0034 and 0037 and Fig. 3, 48, Reiss). Hence, Examiner submits that the game piece disclosed in Reiss would not be rendered inoperable by replacing the event player's identity associated with the trade tickets with a lottery number also since applicant has not recited any particular structure that would affect the disclosure of Reiss or would not be contemplated by Reiss. Moreover, as discussed above, Examiner submits that absent the structure configured to execute a process is merely discussion of intended use of a device and is not given patentable weight when evaluating the claims. Further, if applicant believes that their device is merely "capable of" of performing a function, then the recited device only suggests or makes optional the steps executing the desired function, and thereby does not limit a claim to a particular structure and does not limit the scope of the claim (See MPEP 2106 II, C. Review the Claims). Therefore, Examiner submits that applicants' claims are interpreted as broadly as reasonably allowed in light of the specification in accordance with *In re Zletz* (See *In re Zletz*, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Consequently, applicant's arguments have been deemed to be unpersuasive in light of the evidence disclosed in the Reiss reference, but also with respect to the Dreaper reference and in light of applicant's arguments thereof. Hence, Examiner maintains the grounds of rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as described

in the Non-final Office Action dated 5/28/2008 because each of the features of applicant's claimed invention continues to be unpatentable or obvious over the prior art.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A US-2006/0246983 A1, Huard et al.

B US-5,746,657, Ueno

C US-4,882,473, Bergeron et al.

D US-5,035,422, Berman.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ARTHUR O. HALL whose telephone number is (571)270-1814. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:00am - 5:00 pm, Alt Fri, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. O. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/Scott E. Jones/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714